

## FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of today, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 101) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1998, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 101

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 106(3) of Public Law 105-46 is further amended by striking "November 7, 1997" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 9, 1997", and each provision amended by sections 122 and 123 of such public law shall be applied as if "November 9, 1997" was substituted for "October 23, 1997".*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 101 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the second fiscal year 1998 continuing resolution expires tonight. Currently, 7 of the 13 appropriations bills have been enacted into law and two others are pending at the White House. We have just adopted the conference report on the Labor-HHS bill, leaving three appropriations bills left to finish in the House. Because these remaining bills will not be enacted into law by tonight, it is necessary now to proceed with an extension of the current short-term continuing resolution so that the Government can continue to operate.

The joint resolution now before the House merely extends the provisions of the initial continuing resolution until November 9, or for 2 more days, while we wrap up our work. The basic funding rate would continue to be the current rate. We retain the provisions that lower or restrict those current rates that might be at too high a level and would therefore impinge on final funding levels. Also, the traditional restrictions such as no new starts and 1997

terms and conditions are retained. The expiration date of November 9 should give us time to complete our work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the joint resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I frankly have misgivings and mixed feelings about this continuing resolution. People who know me know that I have a black Irish soul and that I often worry about the downside of life, but even I, until 2 days ago, was very optimistic that we would be able to get out of here with all of our work done on the appropriation bills without the need for a continuing resolution. Indeed, up until 2 days ago, I think we were on that track.

□ 1900

But then something happened, because all of a sudden the flexibility which we thought we saw on the part of that side of the aisle and this side of the aisle all of a sudden seemed to disappear, and now we have heard disturbing rumors about the linkage of fast track legislation with the remaining appropriation bills. And I must say that I find it disconcerting to go into a conference on the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill today and to discover that the conferees are being told that they must begin the conference without knowing what the language is that we will be asked to vote on issues such as the census, for instance.

Now, I happen to be in a peculiar position. I have supported the Republican Party position on the issue of sampling on the census, but it is apparent to me that there is a deal or near deal between the Republican leadership and the White House on that language, and yet rank-and-file Members on neither side of the aisle have so far been given access to whatever that language is.

Now, regardless of one's position on the issue, Members have a right to know what it is, and it seems to me that we would not have this CR before us if games were not being played. We were, in fact, told that one Member of the leadership today indicated that the language on the census could not be made public until the vote on fast track because it would, quote, cost votes on fast track.

Now, I do not know which side of the aisle is likely to be sold out on that issue, whether it is our side of the aisle or their side of the aisle, but somebody apparently is, and it seems to me that what is happening is very simple. These other appropriation bills are being stalled out in terms of our getting any full information until fast track votes have been achieved.

Now, that greatly complicates the appropriations process, it greatly adds to the mistrust in this place, and it is, in my view, the only reason why we even have this CR before us tonight.

The issues on appropriation bills were easily resolvable before they became linked to the fast track train, and it just seems to me that rank-and-file Members need to know that we are in the position of needing yet another CR not because of any failure of the Committee on Appropriations to do its work, or certainly not because of any failure of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or to see to it that these appropriations bills are done, but simply because people at higher levels are linking things that ought not be linked, and, as a result, this committee once again is prevented from doing its business in a timely fashion.

I find that very much regrettable and very much not in the public interest, and I am tempted to call a roll call on this because of that, but in the interests of accommodating the Members who would finally like to get out of here, and get a decent meal, and get some sleep, I will withhold. But I do not think Members ought to be fooled. There is very clearly linkage that certain parties are trying to establish on these issues, and I think that is unfortunate because it gets in the way of our ability to deal with these bills straight up and on the square.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from Wisconsin prepared to yield back the balance of his time?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of staff throughout the House and my own desire to end this long week and engage in further discussions on additional bills tomorrow, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to the order of the House today, the joint resolution is considered read for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### DESIGNATION OF HON. STEVEN C. LATOURETTE TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE ON TODAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC.

November 7, 1997.

I hereby designate the Honorable STEVEN C. LATOURETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to. There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## FAILED TRADE POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, last evening and this morning on television, I heard the President and the Vice President say that if there were a secret vote on the extension of fast track authority, they knew that they would win by a 2- or 3-to-1 margin, because in their hearts the 80 percent of the Democratic caucus which is opposing their misbegotten trade policy would change their minds if they were not being pressured by Big Labor.

I saw the face of Big Labor here today on the Hill, people in their local union jackets with their ball caps, puzzling over maps of the Capitol, looking worried, going office to office, and I stopped to talk to some of them.

That is not what is pressuring or pushing the Democrats on this side of the aisle. We are standing on principle. We have a failed and failing trade policy in this country, a \$160 billion trade deficit, a huge and growing trade deficit with Mexico, United States jobs going south of the border to United States-owned firms exporting their capital, exporting their jobs, to access 80-cents-an-hour labor in the maquiladora area; people living in pallet shacks, walking over bridges, I guess the President would call them the bridges to the 21st century, to these beautiful state-of-the-art United States-built manufacturing plants. Eighty cents an hour; is that the future that we want to push American workers toward? I think not. That is a failed trade policy.

In fact, nothing could be further from the truth than what the President and the Vice President said today. If a secret vote were held when the pressure was off from the White House, and all the deals they are cutting, and the arm-twisting from the Republican leaders and the CEOs, the dozens of chief executive officers of the Fortune 500 companies who jetted into town this week in the luxury of their private jets to twist arms and offer their own deals to Members of Congress, we would beat fast track 2 or 3 to 1.

The White House has turned into a virtual trading bazaar. I cannot believe what I am hearing from my colleagues; offers from the White House of guaranteed \$150,000 fund-raisers before the end of the year to replace any money you might lose from your friends in labor after you sell out the American working people. You know, deals of bridges, deals of military projects that no one wants and haven't been funded, pork; pork is available.

Every member of the White House Cabinet is calling, burning up the lines. They have got a so-called war room here somewhere on Capitol Hill, I do not know where it is, where the 1 or 2 dozen Democrats supporting this are working the phones with intelligence, things are caught on the floor, two members of the Cabinet and to the White House and the President and the Vice President. They are busing people down to the White House. They are offering them the sun, the moon, the stars, and they can offer it. You know why? Because they offered it to everybody for their vote on NAFTA, and they never delivered it. So they can give it away twice. Is it not beautiful? It is a little bit like Lucy and the football.

How many times are Members of Congress going to hear the siren song of President Clinton, and now Vice President Gore, on these issues; the promises that they will fix it all later, or we will have side agreements that take care of the environment and labor, do not worry.

And then people buy that, and then, oops, did I ever talk to you before? Do I know you? And now they need us again 3 years later, and suddenly we have got these great deals, side agreements on labor and the environment, because the Republicans will not let us have anything to do with labor and environment in this bill, and they need the Republican votes.

Well then they maybe ought to get all their votes on that side of the aisle.

But what really made me angry was to hear the President question the motivation of people on this side of the aisle while he is offering people fund-raisers, while he is offering people bridges, while he is offering people other projects.

We have a failed trade policy in this country, and perhaps, just perhaps, this weekend the American people will be well-served by this body. We will begin to question up or down votes on trade policy, no amendments allowed, whatever your concerns or perspectives are, giving up our prerogative as Members of the House of Representatives to perpetuate and continue policies that are piling up huge and growing trade deficits.

You know, someday those bills are going to come due. The U.S. is a trillion dollars in debt overseas, growing at the rate of \$160 billion a year. Someday someone is going to say, we are not so sure of the U.S. economy and the U.S. dollar anymore. We want our money back.

What is going to happen to future generations? We are at the point trade with the deficit where we were with the U.S. fiscal deficit about 10 years ago.

□ 1915

People are saying, oh, it does not matter. Is it not nice they want to lend us that money and run a deficit? We are losing jobs, prosperity. We need a new policy, and we have an opportunity to get it this weekend if we defeat fast track.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

## INDIVIDUAL REINVESTMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my friend from Oregon talk very articulately about the needs of middle-class Americans, and I agree. The middle-class American family has many needs; the need to, of course, provide for current-day living expenses, the need to provide for the futures of their kids and save money for that, the need to provide for safe retirement programs for themselves, the need to provide housing, et cetera.

We did something good for middle-class America this year, because we put in place an Individual Retirement Account Program extension to help them save for those things, because, you see, today, under the Tax Code, the norm is that when we earn money, we are taxed on that income, and then when we put that money away for some future use and we earn income in the form of interest or dividends or capital gains, we are taxed again. So on a lot of America's income, we are not taxed just once, we are taxed twice, once when we earn it and once when it earns some income for us.

So, wisely enough, on a bipartisan basis for middle-class American families, we decided this year to expand the IRA program, and, as far as it went, it was good, and it is good.

This year, the eligibility level or the income total amount that a family can earn is not any longer \$40,000; it is twice that, it is \$80,000. It used to be, last year, that if a spouse was a homemaker, that spouse could not take the